

THE HONORABLE RICARDO S. MARTINEZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

LISA HOOPER, BRANDIE OSBORNE,
KAYLA WILLIS, REAVY WASHINGTON,
individually and on behalf of a class of
similarly situated individuals; EPISCOPAL
DIOCESE OF OLYMPIA, REAL CHANGE,
TRINITY PARISH OF SEATTLE,

Plaintiffs,

VS.

CITY OF SEATTLE, WASHINGTON;
WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION; ROGER MILLAR,
SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
FOR WSDOT, in his official capacity,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-00077-RSM

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR: SEPTEMBER 7, 2017

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
(No. 2:17-cv-00077-RSM)

**CORR CRONIN MICHELSON
BAUMGARDNER FOGG & MOORE LLP**
1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3900
Seattle, Washington 98154-1051
Tel (206) 625-8600
Fax (206) 625-0900

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	II.	A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION IS NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE.....	2
3	A.	Plaintiffs are Likely to Succeed on Their Claim That Defendants' Sweeps Policy and Practice Violates the Federal and Washington State Constitutions.....	3
4	1.	Defendants Seize Plaintiffs' Property and Invade their Homes in Violation of the Fourth Amendment of U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the Washington State Constitution.....	3
5	i.	The City's amended rules allow Defendants to summarily destroy Plaintiffs' property in violation of the State and Federal Constitution.....	3
6	ii.	Defendants' practices of sweeping encampments cause the summary destruction of Plaintiffs' property in violation of the State and Federal Constitution.....	8
7	iii.	Defendants' purported reasons for destroying property fail to pass constitutional muster.....	11
8	2.	Plaintiffs Continue to Suffer Deprivations of Their Property without Due Process in Violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 3 of the Washington State Constitution.....	12
9	i.	The destruction of property, without any method to challenge the destruction violates the 14 th Amendment and Article I, Section 3.....	13
10	ii.	Defendants' Encampment Rules governing emphasis areas, imminent hazards, and purported obstructions deny plaintiffs any due process whatsoever.....	14
11	iii.	Defendants' practices of providing notice prior to sweeps fail to meet minimum due process standards.....	18

1	iv.	Defendants' inept and inaccessible storage measures deprive Plaintiffs of their property without due process.....	22
2	v.	Defendants' purported reasons for not providing adequate notice fail to pass constitutional muster.....	24
3	B.	Class Members Have Suffered and Will Continue to Suffer Irreparable Harm in the Absence of Relief.....	25
4	C.	The Balance of Equities Is in Plaintiffs' Favor.....	29
5	D.	A Preliminary Injunction Is In the Public Interest.....	30
6	III.	CONCLUSION.....	31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Lavan v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 693 F.3d 1022 (9th Cir. 2012).....	2, 12, 13, 22, 29, 30
<i>Mitchell v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 2:16-cv-01750 SJO-JPR (C.D. Cal. April 13, 2016).....	2, 29, 30
<i>Winter v. Natural Res. Defense Council, Inc.</i> , 555 U.S. 7, 129 S. Ct. 365, 172 L. Ed. 2d 249 (2008).....	3
<i>Shell Offshore v. Greenpeace, Inc.</i> , 709 F.3d 1281 (9th Cir. 2013).....	3
<i>Pottinger v. City of Miami</i> , 810 F.Supp. 1551 (S.D. Fla. 1992).....	22
<i>Kincaid v. City of Fresno</i> , No. 1:06-cv-1445 OWW SMS, 2006 WL 3542732 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2006).....	30
<i>Klein v. City of Laguna Beach</i> , 381 F. App'x 723 (9th Cir. 2010).....	30

I. INTRODUCTION

For years, Defendants City of Seattle (the “City”) and the Washington State Department of Transportation (“WSDOT”) have relentlessly conducted sweeps of unhoused communities, forcibly displacing Seattle residents, who often have nowhere else to go, and destroying their homes and personal property in the process. Since this lawsuit was filed on January 19, 2017, Defendants have continued this unconstitutional practice unabated.

Accompanying this motion are 30 declarations and more than 70 exhibits that demonstrate the following:

- The City and WSDOT¹ continue to conduct sweeps of unhoused individuals on public property, now with even greater intensity under the City’s Emergency Operations Command Structure. Between February 22, 2017 and May 1, 2017, Defendants conducted nearly one sweep each day.
- The City’s amended rules governing encampment sweeps eliminate notice requirements for virtually everywhere in the City and give City workers unfettered discretion in determining what property to save.
- Between February 22, 2017 and May 1, 2017, more than 55 percent of Defendants’ sweeps were conducted under the guise of being “obstructions” or “hazards”—and were therefore exempt from any notice requirements under the City’s rules.
- In nearly 30 percent of sweeps conducted between February 22, 2017 and May 1, 2017, Defendants did not store any items.

¹ According to WSDOT, it “coordinates with the City of Seattle (City) for all scheduled cleanups involving WSDOT property in City limits.” ECF 38 at 5 (citing McBride Decl. ¶ 5). Further, “[a]t least for the past year, and for the foreseeable future, WSDOT has agreed that the City’s protocols will be followed for such clean-ups, and follows the City’s lead in accomplishing those processes.” *Id.* But WSDOT still conducts sweeps on its own where it cannot secure cooperation from the City before it wishes to conduct the sweep. *See* L. Pascubillo Dep. at 22:25-23:5 attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of B. Schuster. And the City acknowledges that in the past WSDOT has failed to follow the MDARs regarding safeguarding personal property. A. Drake-Ericson Dep. at 83:17-86:16 attached as Exhibit B to the Declaration of B. Schuster (describing WSDOT “sliding people’s personal property down a steep slope.”).

- 1 Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class have had indispensable personal property
2 seized and destroyed on an almost daily basis as a result of Defendants' conduct. According
3 to Defendants' own documentation, they immediately destroy at least some property of
4 unhoused individuals during the majority of sweeps they conduct.
- 5
- 6 Defendants have an ongoing pattern and practice of disregarding their own rules. The City's
7 own Office of Civil Rights ("OCR") reported that only about two-thirds of the more than
8 50 sweeps at which OCR was present were "in compliance" with the City's rules in 2016.
- 9
- 10 Because Defendants' have given themselves unfettered discretion to seize and destroy
11 property without notice—and in addition fail to follow even their own written policies—
12 Plaintiffs are wholly unprotected by Defendants' written notice and storage procedures.
- 13
- 14 There is no legitimate reason, whether for health or public safety, to seize the property of
15 unhoused individuals, much less to immediately destroy it.

16 A Preliminary Injunction is necessary to prevent ongoing imminent and irreparable
17 harm to Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class ("Plaintiffs"). Defendants have made it
18 clear through their actions and statements that they will continue to engage in the seizure and
19 destruction of property without adequate notice or an opportunity to be heard absent a Court
20 Order. Plaintiffs seek only what the Ninth Circuit directs: an order prohibiting Defendants from
21 seizing and summarily destroying homeless people's property without probable cause and
22 constitutionally adequate notice. *See Lavan v. City of Los Angeles*, 693 F.3d 1022 (9th Cir.
23 2012). The order (which is nearly identical to the injunction affirmed in *Lavan* and the
24 injunction issued in *Mitchell v. City of Los Angeles*, 2:16-cv-01750-SJO-JPR (C.D. Cal. April
13, 2016)) will not impair Defendants' ability to protect the public or perform necessary duties.
It will simply make sure that Defendants do not trample Plaintiffs' constitutional rights.

21 II. A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION IS NECESSARY AND APPROPRIATE

22 "A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish [1] that he is likely to
23 succeed on the merits, [2] that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of
24 preliminary relief, [3] that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and [4] that an injunction is

1 in the public interest.” *Winter v. Natural Res. Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 21, 129 S. Ct.
 2 365, 172 L.Ed.2d 249 (2008). Plaintiffs are not required to show that they *will* succeed on the
 3 merits, only that they are “likely” to prevail. At a minimum, they must show “serious questions
 4 going to the merits[,]” that “the balance of hardships tips sharply in [their] favor,” and the other
 5 two *Winter* factors are satisfied. *Shell Offshore v. Greenpeace, Inc.*, 709 F.3d 1281, 1291 (9th
 6 Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted). All four factors are met here.²

7 **A. Plaintiffs are Likely to Succeed on Their Claim That Defendants’ Sweeps Policy
 8 and Practice Violates the Federal and Washington State Constitutions**

9 As the evidence submitted with this motion demonstrates,³ Defendants have an ongoing
 10 policy and practice of seizing and destroying Plaintiffs’ property without adequate notice, an
 11 opportunity to be heard, or a meaningful way to reclaim their belongings.

12 **1. Defendants Seize Plaintiffs’ Property and Invade their Homes in Violation of
 13 the Fourth Amendment of U.S. Constitution and Article I, Section 7 of the
 14 Washington State Constitution**

15 There is no dispute that unhoused individuals have a property interest in their tents,
 16 blankets, tarps, clothing, medication, personal papers, and other items—and that this property
 17 interest enjoys constitutional protection.⁴ The only question is whether Defendants’ sweeps
 18 result in the unconstitutional destruction of Plaintiffs’ property. They do.

19 **i. The City’s amended rules allow Defendants to summarily destroy
 20 Plaintiffs’ property in violation of the State and Federal Constitution**

21 Although Defendants have a written policy providing for property storage after a sweep,
 22 the policy is vague and leaves the determination of what constitutes storable personal property

23 ² To avoid repetition, Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all of the legal authority and argument contained in
 24 their Motion for a TRO (ECF 23) and Reply in Support of Motion for TRO (ECF 50).

25 ³ These exhibits and declarations are in addition to the 13 declarations submitted to the Court
 26 accompanying Defendants’ Motion for a TRO. *See* ECF 24-33 and 51-54.

27 ⁴ *See, e.g.*, ECF 23 at 13-14, which was not disputed by Defendants in their opposition to the Motion for
 28 Temporary Restraining Order.

1 to the subjective judgment of City personnel. The evidence further demonstrates that the policy
 2 is not understood by City personnel, is applied inconsistently, and results in the destruction of
 3 important personal property.

4 According to their amended rules,⁵ Defendants should store any item that “is reasonably
 5 recognizable as belonging to a person; has apparent utility in its present condition and
 6 circumstances; and is not hazardous.”⁶ Hazardous is defined as “an item that reasonably
 7 appears to pose a health or safety risk to members of the public or to City employees or to other
 8 authorized personnel. Hazardous items may include blankets, clothing, sleeping bags, or other
 9 items depending upon their condition and site conditions.”⁷

10 On its face, the definition is vague and provides impermissible discretion. City
 11 employees governed by the rules agree. For example, Jeff Horan is the City’s “primary” Field
 12 Coordinator who is present at sweeps “on average three times a week” and is responsible for
 13 determining what constitutes personal property.⁸ When Mr. Horan was asked about the
 14 meaning of the amended rule which defines personal property as having “apparent utility in its
 15 present condition,” he stated, “[t]hat’s kind of vague. I mean, I don’t know how to answer that
 16 to be honest with you.”⁹

17

18 ⁵ On April 3, 2017, an amended version of the City’s rules regarding the removal of homeless
 19 encampments became effective. These rules are labeled FAS 17-01 and MDAR 17-01. These rules are
 20 attached as Exhibits C and D to the Declaration of B. Schuster. They will be referred to here as the
 21 “amended rules.”

22 ⁶ FAS 17-01, Rule 3.5, attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

23 ⁷ MDAR 17-01 ¶ 3.12, attached as Exhibit D to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

24 ⁸ Deposition of A. Drake-Ericson at 50:17-19, attached as Exhibit B to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

⁹ Deposition of J. Horan at 101; attached as Exhibit E to the Declaration of B. Schuster. Counsel for
 Defendants attempted to salvage the record on re-direct by suggesting to Mr. Horan that he was actually
 referring to the question as “vague” and not the amended rule. *See* Horan Dep. at 230. A fair reading
 of the questions leading up to Mr. Horan’s testimony makes clear that Mr. Horan understood the question
 that was asked and was indeed referring to the rule as “vague.”

1 City employees engaged in determining what is personal property receive minimal
 2 training. Mr. Horan, for example, testified that he had not received any formal training on
 3 constitutional rights.¹⁰ His training when he was hired in 2016 consisted of talking about the
 4 MDARs with his supervisor, and some in-field training where he could observe sweeps. None
 5 of this training was documented.¹¹ Although Mr. Horan received a powerpoint training on the
 6 new MDARs after they went into effect, the training did not clarify the definition of “personal
 7 property”—as evidenced by his statement that the rule was “vague.”¹²

8 The rule’s vagueness is also reflected in the City’s Office of Civil Rights Report for
 9 2016, which put the City on notice of a “lack of understanding of procedures by City staff” and
 10 a “lack of clarity on what items should be stored.”¹³ The OCR report notes that staff from the
 11 City’s Finance and Administrative Services (FAS) “did not agree with monitors on what should
 12 be stored” and that “[a]t a later date, when the FAS staff person began to throw items away,
 13 OCR monitors began bringing a copy of the protocol so they could remind FAS staff of what
 14 was required.”¹⁴ The OCR report goes on to state:

15 Under the storage protocol, FAS does not store items (including sleeping bags and
 16 blankets) that have been “soiled with chemicals, biological or other hazardous
 17 materials.” **In practice, FAS staff onsite at removals stated they would not store**
 18 **any “soft items.”** In one instance, outreach workers informed monitors that tents
 without dry rot or drug paraphernalia had been thrown away (while out of sight of the
 monitors). When monitors asked the FAS staff person about it, he replied the tents

19 ¹⁰ Deposition of J. Horan at 25:8-18; attached as Exhibit E to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

20 ¹¹ Deposition of J. Horan at 27:29, 32; attached as Exhibit E to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

21 ¹² The WSDOT employee in charge of encampment removals admits that until February 2017 he did
 22 not even know that WSDOT had a policy on encampment removals (L. Pascubillo Dep. at 74:11-24
 23 attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of B. Schuster). In any event, the policy does not appear to
 have been followed as the notices that were previously used by WSDOT failed to meet even its own
 requirements for advising residents of where any property was stored. (L. Pascubillo Dep. at 79:19–
 81:18 attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

24 ¹³ Exhibit 11 to C. Connelly deposition, attached as Exhibit F to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

¹⁴ *Id.*

1 weren't in good enough condition to keep. OCR monitors relayed that **having one staff**
 2 **person make this determination allowed for too much subjectivity in the process.**¹⁵

3 In practice, Defendants use the ambiguous definitions of "property" and "hazardous" to
 4 refuse to store the vast majority of belongings at a site. For example, Defendants refuse to store
 5 belongings that are wet.¹⁶ As Mr. Horan describes, these rules mean that when it is raining, the
 6 City does not store anything that is exposed:

7 Q. . . So basically that means that anything that's wet just doesn't get stored; is that
 8 right?

9 A. . . If things are wet, we aren't able to.

10 . . .

11 Q. . . But a tent, could you store that if it's wet?

12 A. . . Within reason it could, if it could dry, yes.

13 . . .

14 Q. . . Does the City make any effort to dry materials that it finds to be wet before
 15 storing them?

16 A. . . Not storing. We can't really...

17 . . .

18 Q. . . Will you agree that when it rains, tents often get wet in Seattle?

19 A. . . Yes.

20 . . .

21 Q. . . And so if you come across clothes that are wet because they've been in the rain,
 22 you can't store those; isn't that correct?

23 A. . . Yes.

24 Q. . . And if you come across a tent that's been wet because it's been in the rain, you
 25 can't store that; correct?

26 A. . . For the most part. I mean, if it's soaking wet, no.¹⁷

27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 8010
 8011
 8012
 8013
 8014
 8015
 8016
 8017
 8018
 8019
 8020
 8021
 8022
 8023
 8024
 8025
 8026
 8027
 8028
 8029
 8030
 8031
 8032
 8033
 8034
 8035
 8036
 8037
 8038
 8039
 8040
 8041
 8042
 8043
 8044
 8045
 8046
 8047
 8048
 8049
 8050
 8051
 8052
 8053
 8054
 8055
 8056
 8057
 8058
 8059
 8060
 8061
 8062
 8063
 8064
 8065
 8066
 8067
 8068
 8069
 8070
 8071
 8072
 8073
 8074
 8075
 8076
 8077
 8078
 8079
 8080
 8081
 8082
 8083
 8084
 8085
 8086
 8087
 8088
 8089
 8090
 8091
 8092
 8093
 8094
 8095
 8096
 8097
 8098
 8099
 80100
 80101
 80102
 80103
 80104
 80105
 80106
 80107
 80108
 80109
 80110
 80111
 80112
 80113
 80114
 80115
 80116
 80117
 80118
 80119
 80120
 80121
 80122
 80123
 80124
 80125
 80126
 80127
 80128
 80129
 80130
 80131
 80132
 80133
 80134
 80135
 80136
 80137
 80138
 80139
 80140
 80141
 80142
 80143
 80144
 80145
 80146
 80147
 80148
 80149
 80150
 80151
 80152
 80153
 80154
 80155
 80156
 80157
 80158
 80159
 80160
 80161
 80162
 80163
 80164
 80165
 80166
 80167
 80168
 80169
 80170
 80171
 80172
 80173
 80174
 80175
 80176
 80177
 80178
 80179
 80180
 80181
 80182
 80183
 80184
 80185
 80186
 80187
 80188
 80189
 80190
 80191
 80192
 80193
 80194
 80195
 80196
 80197
 80198
 80199
 80200
 80201
 80202
 80203
 80204
 80205
 80206
 80207
 80208
 80209
 80210
 80211
 80212
 80213
 80214
 80215
 80216
 80217
 80218
 80219
 80220
 80221
 80222
 80223
 80224
 80225
 80226
 80227
 80228
 80229
 80230
 80231
 80232
 80233
 80234
 80235
 80236
 80237
 80238
 80239
 80240
 80241
 80242
 80243
 80244
 80245
 80246
 80247
 80248
 80249
 80250
 80251
 80252
 80253
 80254
 80255
 80256
 80257
 80258
 80259
 80260
 80261
 80262
 80263
 80264
 80265
 80266
 80267
 80268
 80269
 80270
 80271
 80272
 80273
 80274
 80275
 80276
 80277
 80278
 80279
 80280
 80281
 80282
 80283
 80284
 80285
 80286
 80287
 80288
 80289
 80290
 80291
 80292
 80293
 80294
 80295
 80296
 80297
 80298
 80299
 80300
 80301
 80302
 80303
 80304
 80305
 80306
 80307
 80308
 80309
 80310
 80311
 80312
 80313
 80314
 80315
 80316
 80317
 80318
 80319
 80320
 80321
 80322
 80323
 80324
 80325
 80326
 80327
 80328
 80329
 80330
 80331
 80332
 80333
 80334
 80335
 80336
 80337
 80338
 80339
 80340
 80341
 80342
 80343
 80344
 80345
 80346
 80347
 80348
 80349
 80350
 80351
 80352
 80353
 80354
 80355
 80356
 80357
 80358
 80359
 80360
 80361
 80362
 80363
 80364
 80365
 80366
 80367
 80368
 80369
 80370
 80371
 80372
 80373
 80374
 80375
 80376
 80377
 80378
 80379
 80380
 80381
 80382
 80383
 80384
 80385
 80386
 80387
 80388
 80389
 80390
 80391
 80392
 80393
 80394
 80395
 80396
 80397
 80398
 80399
 80400
 80401
 80402
 80403
 80404
 80405
 80406
 80407
 80408
 80409
 80410
 80411
 80412
 80413
 80414
 80415
 80416
 80417
 80418
 80419
 80420
 80421
 80422
 80423
 80424
 80425
 80426
 80427
 80428
 80429
 80430
 80431
 80432
 80433
 80434
 80435
 80436
 80437
 80438
 80439
 80440
 80441
 80442
 80443
 80444
 80445
 80446
 80447
 80448
 80449
 80450
 80451
 80452
 80453
 80454
 80455
 80456
 80457
 80458
 80459
 80460
 80461
 80462
 80463
 80464
 80465
 80466
 80467
 80468
 80469
 80470
 80471
 80472
 80473
 80474
 80475
 80476
 80477
 80478
 80479
 80480
 80481
 80482
 80483
 80484
 80485
 80486
 80487
 80488
 80489
 80490
 80491
 80492
 80493
 80494
 80495
 80496
 80497
 80498
 80499
 80500
 80501
 80502
 80503
 80504
 80505
 80506
 80507
 80508
 80509
 80510
 80511
 80512
 80513
 80514
 80515
 80516
 80517
 80518
 80519
 80520
 80521
 80522
 80523
 80524
 80525
 80526
 80527
 80528
 80529
 80530
 80531
 80532
 80533
 80534
 80535
 80536
 80537
 80538
 80539
 80540
 80541
 80542
 80543
 80544
 80545
 80546
 80547
 80548
 80549
 80550
 80551
 80552
 80553
 80554
 80555
 80556
 80557
 80558

1 Monitors from the Office of Civil Rights notified FAS personnel of concerns with Defendants'
 2 practice of discarding any property that was subjectively determined to be wet or potentially
 3 moist¹⁸—but Defendants have continued to destroy this property anyway.

4 The City also refuses to store items that City workers subjectively determine to be
 5 muddy¹⁹ or in less-than-perfect condition. Mr. Horan testified that he declared a tent with only
 6 two small visible tears to be “damaged beyond repair” such that it was not storable.²⁰ Also
 7 subject to disposal are homes or belongings that are *near* drug paraphernalia (even if no drugs
 8 are present),²¹ that are by garbage, that smell like urine, or that are suspected to have touched
 9 urine.²²

10 These criteria render virtually every unhoused persons’ property potentially unstorable.
 11 It rained in Seattle on nearly 70 percent of all days between October 2016 and March 2017.²³
 12 The amount of rainfall this winter set a 122-year record²⁴ and Pacific Northwest winters are
 13 only expected to get wetter with a changing climate.²⁵ And because Defendants frequently

14 ¹⁸ Connelly Dep. 48:14–25, *id.* at 54:12–17; *id.* at 95:22–96:10 (attached as Exhibit G to the Declaration
 15 of B. Schuster).

16 ¹⁹ Declaration of C. Potts ¶ 9 and Exhibit 4 attached to the declaration of C. Potts wherein Julie Moore
 17 also explains that only furniture that is not muddy will be stored; Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 22.

18 ²⁰ Deposition of J. Horan at 198–200; attached as Exhibit E to the Declaration of B. Schuster; Exhibit 4
 19 to Horan Dep. attached as Exhibit H to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

20 ²¹ See Ericson Dep Exhibit 8 at COS_028300, attached as Exhibit I to the Declaration of B. Schuster;
 21 Connelly Dep. 52:3–23 (describing the subjectivity of determining whether or not to preserve any
 22 property if drug paraphernalia was visible) (attached as Exhibit G to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

23 ²² Deposition of J. Horan at 111–113; attached as Exhibit E to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

24 ²³ See “Seattle has had almost no sunny days since October” March 28, 2017, available at
<http://www.seattlepi.com/local/weather/article/Seattle-has-had-almost-no-sunny-days-since-October-11034669.php> (citing data from the National Weather Service).

25 ²⁴ <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/weather/seattle-just-broke-a-122-year-old-record-for-rain-because-of-course-it-did/>

26 ²⁵ See City of Seattle, Seattle Public Utilities, “Projected Climate Changes”, available at
<http://www.seattle.gov/Util/EnvironmentConservation/ClimateChangeProgram/ProjectedChanges/index.htm>.

conduct sweeps when it is raining, their rules permit them immediately to destroy any tents or structures.²⁶ And then, because Defendants often destroy tents or structures before safeguarding the property inside, these belongings are exposed to the rain and also subject to immediate destruction.²⁷ Many unhoused individuals put their homes on the ground, meaning they are often soiled or muddy—and thereby subject to destruction.²⁸ It is also not abnormal for people who lack access to bathrooms to urinate in bottles or plastic containers, which may result in the smell of urine near their home—and thereby subject their belongings to destruction. Wear and tear on belongings is also normal, particularly when one is forced to move repeatedly and lacks a moving truck or boxes. Yet, this justification is also used by the City to justify the immediate destruction of Plaintiffs' property during a sweep.

ii. Defendants' practices of sweeping encampments cause the summary destruction of Plaintiffs' property in violation of the State and Federal Constitution

Defendants' destruction of unhoused persons' property extends even further than their own rules permit. Defendants have explicitly refused to store numerous other items that are not mentioned in their rules, including but not limited to items that do not fit in the designated

²⁶ Horan Dep. at 127-134 (attached as Exhibit E to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

²⁷ See e.g. Exhibits 9-11 attached to the Declaration of C. Cirillo; Exhibits 13-16, attached to the declaration of R. Lahiri; Exhibits 31-33, attached to the Declaration of S. Stephens; and Exhibits J-R attached to the Declaration of B. Schuster, which show the summary destruction of tents and structures. See also the Declarations of O. Mansker-Stoker ¶ 15; A. Roberts ¶ 31-33; Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 26-27.

²⁸ Under the amended rules, Defendants do not consider building materials that are used to erect shelters “property” and therefore immediately destroy these items in sweeps. FAS 17-01 at 3.5, attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster. Further, unhoused individuals’ requests to the City for wood chips, gravel, or other assistance to prevent their belongings from becoming soiled or muddy have been denied. *See Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 16-17; Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 10.*

1 storage bins,²⁹ items that are “too expensive,”³⁰ and items that an individual did not pack up
 2 themselves.³¹ If a person is unable to move those items—which happens frequently due to
 3 Defendants’ refusal to provide adequate and effective notice—they are destroyed by
 4 Defendants on the spot.

5 Whether pursuant to their own policies, or in violation thereof, Defendants’ sweeps
 6 consistently result in the destruction of unhoused individuals’ property. According to the City’s
 7 spreadsheet of sweeps conducted between February 22, 2017 and May 1, 2017, Defendants did
 8 not store any property in nearly 30 percent of sweeps they conducted.³² Although this
 9 spreadsheet does not detail exactly what happens to property, the documentation the City has
 10 made publicly available online indicates the City destroys property in the majority of sweeps it
 11 conducts.³³ This is supported by the testimony of the WSDOT employee in charge of homeless

12
 13
 14
 15

²⁹ Declaration of Garth Carroll ¶ 6; (“I had some brand new cabinets I wanted to store and other larger
 16 belongings. I was told that they were too big and that when they were offering storage for belongings,
 17 they meant things like a tent or sleeping bag.”); Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 10 (“However it [the
 18 City] would not store things not in a bin. Meaning everything you wanted stored had to wrapped in
 plastic and fit in the bin. If something couldn’t fit in the bin, it wouldn’t be stored.”)

³⁰ Declaration of Phillip Pitts ¶ 10 (“I have been told by the City they don’t want to store things that
 19 expensive because they don’t want to be liable for those items.”).

³¹ Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 20 (“The City only stores property if you packed it up in a tote
 20 yourself.”); Declaration of T. Peila ¶ 10 (“I called the Customer Service Bureau line on Thursday, April
 21 13, 2017 to see if any of my belongings were stored. I was redirected to the Operations Manager, Kenny,
 22 and he told me if I wasn’t there to pack up my stuff for storage, that the City didn’t have them. I was told
 that there has to be a name on someone’s belongings in order for them to be stored.”)

³² COS_038747, attached as Exhibit S to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

³³ The City publishes site journals for a number of sweeps they conduct wherein they contend notice
 23 was provided. *See* online at <https://www.seattle.gov/homelessness/unauthorized-encampments/encampment-removals#may8122017>. Many of these journals indicate the City
 24 destroyed at least some property at the site.

1 encampment removals, Lance Pascubillo. Of the approximately 80 sweeps that he has been at
 2 in the past year,³⁴ he has seen storage provided for individuals only “three or four times.”³⁵

3 These statistics are consistent with the declarations submitted. For example, at the
 4 March 7, 2017 sweep of the Field, Aedan Roberts stood by helplessly as “the City used box
 5 cutters on or would otherwise dismantle high quality tents on top of everything inside the tent.
 6 In one for example, I could see through the door a mattress and sleeping bag set on top of milk
 7 cartons—the person clearly had a nice bed set up. But the City just took apart everything and
 8 destroyed it.”³⁶ Mr. Roberts witnessed the summary and immediate destruction of at least ten
 9 tents while he was in the area, and not once did he see “anyone taking things outside of the tent
 10 and setting it aside if a person wasn’t there.”³⁷ The declarations of Jon Grant, Ann-Dee Levine,
 11 Reavy Washington, Olivia Mansker-Stoker, and Alicia Raftery describe the same wanton
 12 destruction of property.³⁸ Twelve Videos submitted with this motion provide incontrovertible
 13 evidence of City workers tearing apart Plaintiffs’ homes using box cutters and knives without
 14 removing any belongings inside.³⁹ This footage also shows City workers throwing property
 15 either on top of the newly destroyed home, or in piles to be bulldozed.⁴⁰

16

17 ³⁴ Deposition of L. Pascubillo at 27:22-28:2 attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

18 ³⁵ *Id.* at 30-31 attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

19 ³⁶ Declaration of A. Roberts ¶ 29.

20 ³⁷ Declaration of A. Roberts ¶¶ 28, 31.

21 ³⁸ Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 27-28; Declaration of A. Levine ¶ 27-30; Declaration of O. Mansker-
 Stoker ¶ 15; Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 22; Declaration of A. Raftery ¶ 5 (c)(iii).

22 ³⁹ Exhibit 5 attached to the declaration of A. Roberts; Exhibits 6-7 attached to the Declaration of A.
 23 Levine, Exhibits 31-33 attached to the Declaration of S. Stephens; Exhibits J-R attached to the
 Declaration of B. Schuster.

24 ⁴⁰ Exhibit 5 attached to the Declaration of A. Roberts; Exhibits 6-7 attached to the Declaration of A.
 Levine, Exhibits 31-33 attached to the Declaration of S. Stephens; Exhibits J-R attached to the
 Declaration of B. Schuster.

1 This policy and practice of property destruction has persisted even after the City's new
 2 rules were implemented. At a sweep on April 11, 2017 under the West Seattle Bridge, Edward
 3 Rodriguez observed "about ten tents being destroyed," within an hour of Defendants showing
 4 up.⁴¹ Workers were "using knives to slash open tents and cut tent tie-down ropes in a manner
 5 that ruined the tents and appeared unnecessary. For example, instead of pulling down tent poles
 6 normally, the workers would cut the fabric pockets holding the ends of the tent poles, so that
 7 the tent could no longer support a pole and was thus rendered useless. The workers were doing
 8 this to tents that appeared intact and functional."⁴² Eight videos accompanying this motion
 9 show Defendants engaging in on-the-spot destruction of Plaintiffs' personal property.⁴³ As the
 10 declarations cited *supra* and an additional 19 photos and videos pertaining to sweeps conducted
 11 in the past six months demonstrate, this wholesale destruction of property is the norm rather
 12 than the exception.⁴⁴

13 **iii. Defendants' purported reasons for destroying property fail to pass
 14 constitutional muster**

15 Defendants' seek to justify their wholesale destruction of Plaintiffs' belongings on
 16 grounds of public health and safety but have no scientific evidence on which to rely. For
 17 example, the City's required disposal of any item that may have come in contact with urine is
 18 not grounded in fact: Mr. Horan's testimony that urine is hazardous because it can transmit
 19 Hepatitis⁴⁵ is refuted by the attached declaration of public health expert, Dr. Bill Daniell. Dr.

20 ⁴¹ Declaration of E. Rodriguez ¶ 10 (a).

21 ⁴² Declaration of R. Lahiri ¶ 19.

22 ⁴³ Exhibits 9-11 attached to the declaration of C. Cirillo; Exhibits 13-17 attached to the declaration of
 23 R. Lahiri.

24 ⁴⁴ Exhibits J-R attached to the Declaration of B. Schuster; Exhibits 24-30 and 41-45 attached to the
 25 declaration of S. Stephens; Exhibits 12, 18-20, and 22-23 attached to the Declaration of R. Lahiri. *See*
 26 also Exhibits 48-50 attached to the Declaration of Edward Wixler, which show Defendants engaging in
 27 the same on-the-spot destruction of Plaintiffs' property in the fall of 2016.

28 ⁴⁵ Deposition of J. Horan at 108:13; attached as Exhibit E to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

1 Daniell is a physician and epidemiologist who has taught for 30 years at the University of
 2 Washington Schools of Medicine and Public Health. As Dr. Daniell notes, the transmission of
 3 Hepatitis B and C, as well as other blood borne pathogens, are typically not linked to urine
 4 transmission. “Urine that does not contain visible blood is not regarded, under the standard, as
 5 blood or other potentially infectious material.”⁴⁶ The use of “basic worker precautions” and the
 6 drying of any potentially contaminated material (i.e., the same treatment of any materials that
 7 are wet) would mitigate any potential risk.⁴⁷

8 Neither do Defendants have a legitimate government interest in refusing to store
 9 Plaintiffs’ property because it is wet, in less than perfect condition, of a particular size, or
 10 otherwise is inconvenient to the City, yet fails to present an immediate threat to public safety.
 11 *See Lavan* 693 F.3d at 1024 (affirming order enjoining seizure absent immediate threat). Just
 12 as the government cannot act without due process to bulldoze a brick and mortar house because
 13 it has a broken window or a leak in the roof, neither can it destroy a tent home because it is torn
 14 or wet. The unbridled discretion to deem personal belongings garbage, debris, and waste, and
 15 to destroy them, is nothing short of “collecting and destroying [the homeless litigants’] property
 16 on the spot,” which is the policy and practice the *Lavan* court ruled unreasonable and in
 17 violation of the Fourth Amendment. *Lavan*, 693 F.3d at 1030.

18 **2. Plaintiffs Continue to Suffer Deprivations of Their Property without Due
 19 Process in Violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and
 Article I, Section 3 of the Washington State Constitution**

20 There is also no dispute that unhoused individuals are entitled to due process before the
 21 City or WSDOT seize and/or destroy their property.⁴⁸ The question is whether Defendants
 22

23 ⁴⁶ Declaration of B. Daniell ¶ 17.
 24

⁴⁷ *Id.* ¶¶ 20-25.

⁴⁸ *See* ECF 23 at 14-18.

1 provide adequate and effective notice and an opportunity to be heard before permanently
 2 depriving Plaintiffs' of their property. *Lavan*, 693 F.3d at 1030 ("Application of the Fourteenth
 3 Amendment's due process protections require the familiar two-stage analysis": (1) "whether
 4 the asserted individuals interests are encompassed within the Fourteenth Amendment's
 5 protection of 'life, liberty or property'"; and (2) "if protected interests are implicated, we must
 6 then decide what procedures constitute due process of law."). They do not.

7 **i. The destruction of property, without any method to challenge the
 8 destruction violates the 14th Amendment and Article I, Section 3**

9 As discussed in greater detail *supra*, Defendants engage in the wholesale destruction
 10 of Plaintiffs' property when conducting a sweep, occasionally saving a few items while
 11 treating everything else as garbage. This immediate destruction provides no means for
 12 unhoused individuals to get their property back. For example, as Mr. Washington describes
 13 his experience at the sweep of the Field:

14 "[t]here was no opportunity for people to get their stuff once it was heaped into a pile—
 15 it was immediately destroyed. And because it was raining, everything was made wet
 16 and soiled. The way the tents were taken down and the belongings piled into a mound,
 17 it was clear that the City was doing stuff to make sure the property couldn't be used in
 18 case someone came back to get it."⁴⁹

19 Garth Carroll details similar experiences:

20 "Every time I have been swept or know of people who have been swept, the City has
 21 thrown everything in the area in the garbage . . . And the way they take things down is
 22 to damage or destroy people's belongings. If any individual is not there to move their
 23 belongings . . . all of their property is thrown in the garbage. And there is no inquiry
 24 into where that person is. Even if someone is nearby and cannot move all of their
 25 property, it is thrown in the garbage. Even if someone's name is on the property, it
 26 doesn't make any difference—everything is treated like garbage—people's medication,
 27 tents, things to survive."⁵⁰

28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50

⁴⁹ Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 22.

⁵⁰ Declaration of G. Carroll at ¶ 10.

1 Likewise, Aedan Roberts described the City's actions:

2 "At that point, your tent is slashed with a box cutter, making it unusable. It's in a trash
3 pile with actual trash. It's wet, muddy. The piles then go then into the dumpster or
4 dump truck. The way the city conducted their actions, there was absolutely no way
5 someone could have recovered their belongings if they did not happen to be there at the
time of the sweep."⁵¹

6 Further, there is no opportunity for individuals to object to this destruction. As Plaintiff Brandie
7 Osborne explains, when asked if she objected to the destruction of her personal property:

8 Q: So you objected to them?

9 A: Like, well yeah. But what—what can you do? I mean, you either lay in front of the
10 bulldozer, which is not a smart thing to do unless you have a lot of people behind you
11 to support you. You don't do anything. You just pick up what you can and carry on
12 and keep going."⁵²

13 **ii. Defendants' Encampment Rules governing emphasis areas,
14 imminent hazards, and purported obstructions deny plaintiffs any
15 due process whatsoever**

16 The City's amended rules, on their face and in application, deny Plaintiffs and fellow
17 class members basic constitutional rights in their personal property. Far from expanding
18 protections to unhoused individuals,⁵³ the amended rules enable the City to remove and destroy
19 the belongings of virtually any unhoused person on City property without notice—as long as
20 the City can deem the unhoused person or their property an "obstruction" or "immediate

21 ⁵¹ Declaration of A. Roberts ¶ 33. See also Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 28; Declaration of A. Raftery at ¶
22 5(c)(iii); Declaration of O. Mansker-Stoker ¶ 16-17; Declaration of M. Christian; Declaration of R.
23 Lahiri ¶ 17; Declaration of T. Alexander ¶ 11; and Declaration of R. Massey ¶ 3.

24 ⁵² Deposition of B. Osborne at 43, 106, attached as Exhibit T to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

⁵³ Cf. Letter from Mayor Edward Murray to the Seattle City Council, July 29, 2016, available at <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/3026940-Mayor-Murray-Letter-to-Council-Members-Regarding.html>; see also, "City: Next time homeless are cleared they will get notice" Crosscut, Jan. 31, 2017, available at <http://crosscut.com/2017/01/city-next-time-homeless-are-cleared-they-will-get-notice/>

1 hazard.”⁵⁴ While the City claims these two categories are exceptions, the “exceptions” are
 2 described so broadly and ambiguously defined that they eliminate virtually any requirement of
 3 notice and to provide City employees with unbounded discretion in deciding when
 4 encampments can be moved without notice.

5 The amended rules define an obstruction as:

6 tents, personal property, garbage, debris or other objects related to an encampment that:
 7 are in a City park or on a public sidewalk; interfere with the pedestrian or transportation
 8 purposes of public rights-of-way; or interfere with areas that are necessary for or
 essential to the intended use of a public property or facility.⁵⁵

9 And the amended rules define a hazard as:

10 an encampment where people camping outdoors are at risk of serious injury or death
 11 beyond that caused by increased exposure to the elements or their presence creates a
 12 risk of serious injury or death to others; including but not limited to encampments at
 13 highway shoulders and off-ramps, areas exposed to moving vehicles, areas that can only
 be accessed by crossing driving lanes outside of a legal crosswalk, and landslide-prone
 areas.⁵⁶

14 The City has used both of these categories to justify conducting at least 28 sweeps
 15 between February 22, 2017 and May 1, 2017 under the pretense of being a hazard or obstruction
 16 and thereby exempt from any of the City’s notice requirements.⁵⁷ This constitutes more than
 17 55 percent of sweeps conducted within this time period.

18 Rather than addressing immediate public health and safety concerns, the City’s hazard
 19 and obstruction categories are regularly utilized as convenient rationales to more quickly
 20 conduct sweeps—and without the need to follow the normal notice and property preservation

21
 22 ⁵⁴ See FAS Encampment Rule 17-01 ¶ 3.3, 3.4, and 4.1 (attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

23 ⁵⁵ FAS Encampment Rule 17-01 ¶ 3.4; attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

24 ⁵⁶ FAS Encampment Rule 17-01 ¶ 3.3; attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

⁵⁷ COS_038747 (attached as Exhibit S to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

1 procedures. For example, Defendants conducted two sweeps in the Spokane Street area on
 2 March 29, 2017 and April 11, 2017. Defendants classified both sweeps as obstructions subject
 3 to immediate removal, even though unhoused individuals like Rebecca Massey had been living
 4 there for months.⁵⁸ Defendants' justification for conducting these sweeps included things like
 5 replacing copper wire that had been stolen more than 6 months prior, RV fires that occurred
 6 back in January of 2017 and the week earlier, and a woman being confronted near the area (even
 7 though the City did not know whether the individual who confronted the woman was even a
 8 part of the encampment).⁵⁹ These reasons neither appear to fit within the amended rules'
 9 definition of "obstruction" nor explain why notice could not be provided to residents.

10 Similarly, the City's professed concern about the health of unhoused individuals is
 11 belied by statements that show the City is intent only on moving people and clearing areas of
 12 unhoused individuals. In a September 2016 email to WSDOT, the City's Encampment
 13 Response Team Program Manager, August Drake-Ericson, encourages WSDOT to "clean up
 14 all of the structures including the tents" and "make the tents move" when she learns that
 15 WSDOT is planning to move only hard structures from an encampment.⁶⁰ In another email
 16 exchange with WSDOT, Ms. Drake-Ericson encourages WSDOT to "start thinking of how we
 17 can reclaim [a] space" so that WSDOT doesn't have to repeatedly conduct sweeps of the same
 18 area.⁶¹ Officer Eric Zerr further stated that it is a "high priority" for WSDOT and the City Parks
 19

20

 58 Declaration of R. Massey ¶ 1.

21 59 Declaration of G. Carroll ¶ 13; <http://homelessness.seattle.gov/reducing-hazards-under-low-bridge-structures-beginning-with-the-spokane-street-viaduct/>; <http://homelessness.seattle.gov/addressing-trash-and-tents-under-the-spokane-street-viaduct/>

22 60 Exhibit 4 to Drake-Ericson Dep. (attached as Exhibit U to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

23 61 See December 5, 2016 email chain (at p. 2) attached as an Exhibit V to the Declaration of B. Schuster; see also B. Schuster Decl. Ex. W, deposition of E. Zerr at 73:2–12 (characterizing a sweep as "worthwhile" because the property could finally be secured from future public access)

1 Department to clear out unhoused individuals in order to restrict future access.⁶² When
 2 reporting back to a community member who is complaining about an encampment, WSDOT
 3 reports that Ms. Drake-Ericson is “working hard on the City to loosen its grip and move back
 4 to trespassing people.”⁶³ And in minutes from a March 2017 meeting of the City’s Emergency
 5 Operations Command when discussing the top 40 prioritized encampment sites, Ms. Drake-
 6 Ericson stated that “the ultimate goal is to have people removed from unauthorized sites and
 7 only regular maintenance of sites to be performed.”⁶⁴ These statements reflect the City’s
 8 ultimate goal of simply “moving” unhoused individuals around through repeated sweeps in
 9 hopes that they will not return.

10 This intent is made all the more apparent by the City’s prohibition of camping in large
 11 swathes of public property that offer some form of shelter from the elements and access to
 12 services and that people with housing seldom use. Through the amended rules, the City has
 13 granted itself the authority to immediately seize and destroy the property of unhoused persons
 14 who have property in any of the ten “emphasis areas.”⁶⁵ These are areas designated by the City
 15 wherein camping is completely prohibited.⁶⁶ Although the amended rules impose limits on the
 16 number of emphasis areas the City can establish, the areas can be of any size and anywhere
 17 within the City limits.⁶⁷ According to the City’s Emphasis Map, seven such areas have already
 18 been designated, many of which are massive areas where many unhoused people have
 19
 20

21 ⁶² Zerr Dep. 78:9–79:12 (attached as Exhibit W to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

22 ⁶³ See November 2016 email chain (at p. 1) attached as an Exhibit X to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

23 ⁶⁴ Exhibit 6 to Drake-Ericson Dep. (at p. 2) attached as Exhibit Y to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

24 ⁶⁵ FAS 17-01 at 3.1; and 13.1-13.6 attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster

⁶⁶ FAS 17-01 at 13.3 attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster.

⁶⁷ *Id.*

1 previously found refuge.⁶⁸ For example, Mr. Washington lived at the Field for a year⁶⁹; Ms.
 2 Hooper lived on Freedom Hill for approximately two years⁷⁰; and Ms. Massey lived at the
 3 Spokane area eight months before each became emphasis areas.⁷¹

4 Exhibit 51 accompanying this motion shows the few areas in which, according to the
 5 amended rules, Defendants are required to provide 72 hours' notice prior to clearing an
 6 encampment.⁷² Almost every piece of public property in the City could qualify as an
 7 "obstruction," "hazard" or is already designated as an emphasis area under Defendants' own
 8 rules.

9 **iii. Defendants' practices of providing notice prior to sweeps fail to meet
 10 minimum due process standards**

11 Defendants have provided unhoused Seattle residents living outside with misleading,
 12 conflicting, confusing, and otherwise inadequate notice before seizing and destroying their
 13 property in violation of the law and their own rules. Sometimes this means Defendants neglect
 14 to provide any notice at all before coming to an unhoused person's home and demanding that
 15 they immediately move all of their belongings under threat that anything left behind will be
 16 thrown in the garbage. This has happened as recently as May 22, 2017 when Defendants
 17 conducted a sweep at Columbia Street and Western Avenue. Around nine or ten in the morning,
 18 a Sergeant told Timothy Alexander he had "30 minutes to pack up [his] stuff or the cleanup
 19 crew would throw it away."⁷³ "There was no notice posted of the sweep beforehand" and no

20
 21 ⁶⁸ <https://www.seattle.gov/homelessness/unauthorized-encampments/emphasis-map>.

22 ⁶⁹ Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 7;

23 ⁷⁰ L. Hooper Deposition at 12:1-8 (attached as Exhibit Z to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

24 ⁷¹ Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 7; Declaration of R. Massey ¶ 1.

⁷²Attached to the Declaration of C. Rutan.

⁷³ Declaration of T. Alexander ¶ 6-7.

1 one had informed Mr. Alexander that the City was “going to be sweeping the area.”⁷⁴ Anna
 2 Gibson lived in the same area, and had stepped away for just 45 minutes, during which time the
 3 sweep occurred. When she returned, her tent “and all of the belongings of my fiancée and
 4 myself were gone. The other four or five tents that belonged to my neighbors were also gone.”⁷⁵
 5 She too never saw a posting before the sweep occurred.⁷⁶ The same thing happened to Teresa
 6 Peila on April 7, 2017. Teresa stepped away from her home for just the afternoon—when she
 7 returned, she discovered everything she owned had been taken by Defendants in another
 8 unannounced sweep.⁷⁷

9 Defendants do sometimes post a flyer or sticker, warning residents that they must move
 10 and that anything not moved will be discarded. These postings do not however, provide
 11 sufficient information about when and where a sweep will actually occur.⁷⁸ Many include, for
 12 example, inadequate or confusing descriptions of areas.⁷⁹ Often, Defendants offer conflicting
 13 information to residents as to why, when, and where a sweep will occur.⁸⁰

14 ⁷⁴ *Id.*

15 ⁷⁵ Declaration of A. Gisbson ¶ 8.

16 ⁷⁶ Declaration of A. Gibson ¶ 10.

17 ⁷⁷ Declaration of T. Peila ¶ 7-8.

18 ⁷⁸ Declaration of E. Rodriguez ¶ 13 (“Over the course of sweeps I’ve seen, postings are vague.
 19 Sometimes tents will be posted with order to remove stickers and a date; that’s not always the case. The
 20 order to remove sticker is just a picture of a camper in a tent crossed out. The stickers are also
 21 meaningless without context. The order to remove where? What?); Hooper Dep. 31:25–32:10, attached
 22 as Exhibit Z to the Declaration of B. Schuster (“[B]asically your life went on hold after you were
 23 posted.”).

24 ⁷⁹ For example, “Between I-5 Northbound Exit on Dearborn.” *See*

<https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Homelessness/cleanups/03-21-17-Dearborn-I-5.pdf>;
 and “West Galer Street Flyover & Surrounding Area.” *See*

<https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Homelessness/cleanups/04-27-17-Galer-Flyover.pdf>.

25 ⁸⁰ Declaration of O. Mansker-Stoker ¶ 28, G. Carroll ¶ 13; P. Pitts ¶ 12; and A. Levine ¶ 32-36 (noting
 26 significant confusion among residents living near the Spokane Street viaduct about where a sweep would
 27 actually occur); Declaration of R. Massey ¶ 7-8 detailing the same (“After an RV fire four nights ago,
 28 Police Officers told us they had declared an emergency, none of the protocols applied, and we’d have
 29 to leave that day. Then they said they’d come back tomorrow. Then word of mouth said Tuesday. Then

1 Defendants frequently fail to come on the day indicated on the posting and sweep areas
 2 other than those indicated on the posting.⁸¹ As recently as Memorial Day of 2017, again at
 3 Columbia Street and Western Avenue, Defendants summarily informed Ms. Gibson that she
 4 had to “evacuate” the area.⁸² At the time, her fiancée was at work, and she was unable to move
 5 all of her belongings herself, so she stayed in her tent, missing her shift at Real Change and
 6 prolonging using the restroom because she was concerned about Defendants conducting a
 7 sweep while she was momentarily absent.⁸³ Although she waited for hours, “the clean up crew
 8 and police never returned to conduct the sweep.”⁸⁴

9 And, in direct violation of their own rules, Defendants often post notices that provide
 10 less than 72 hours’ notice.⁸⁵ For example:

11 • Defendants’ posting dated January 9, 2017 with a time of 2:00pm indicates “Rainier
 12 Ave., Hillside, Bus Terminal, and Surrounding Grounds” will be cleared on January 12,
 13 2017 at 8:45am.⁸⁶

14
 15 we read an article in the paper saying the 17th. The police came today and said it will happen tomorrow.
 16 Nothing has been posted.”); Declaration of T. Cross Declaration ¶ 4-5 (regarding the same).

17 E.g. Declaration of G. Carroll ¶ 5 (regarding a sweep that occurred in October 2016 where notices
 18 were posted in a different area, yet the area he was living in was swept); Declaration of O. Mansker-
 19 Stoker ¶ 7 (noting the City did not show up for a sweep under the Ballard Bridge until the day after the
 20 posting claimed it would happen); Declaration of R. Lahiri ¶ 5 (regarding the same); Deposition of
 21 Brandie Osborne at 14 (describing a specific incident where 72 hour postings were put up, but two days
 22 later, somebody showed up and did a cleanup of another area but not the area that was originally posted)
 23 (attached as Exhibit T to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

24
 25 ⁸¹ Declaration of A. Gibson ¶ 17.

⁸² Declaration of A. Gibson ¶ 18-20.

⁸³ Declaration of A. Gibson ¶ 21.

⁸⁴ FAS 17-01 at 6.3, attached as Exhibit C to the Declaration of B. Schuster (“The notice shall be posted
 26 no fewer than 72 hours before an encampment removal and shall provide a removal date no more than
 27 7 days after the notice posting date.”).

⁸⁵ COS_006637 (attached as Exhibit AA to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

- 1 Defendants' posting dated January 27, 2017 with a time of 2:30pm indicates "42nd and
Pasadena" will be cleared beginning January 30, 2017 at 9:30am.⁸⁷
- 2 Defendants' posting dated February 6, 2017 with a time of 8:30am indicates "7th and
3 NW 42nd" will be cleared on February 8, 2017 at 8:45am.⁸⁸
- 4 Defendants' posting dated March 14, 2017 with a time of 4:00pm indicates "I-5
5 Northbound 45th and 50th Exists and On Ramps" will be cleared on March 17, 2017 at
8:00am.⁸⁹
- 6 Defendants also conducted a sweep in the James Street area on March 24, 2017. The
7 City put up notices prior to the sweep, which indicated they were posted on March 21,
8 2017 at 2:00pm. The notices stated material would be removed "no less than 72 hours
9 from the date and time posted above."⁹⁰ However, the date and time listed for the sweep
was Friday, March 24, 2017 at 8:00am—66 hours after the date of the posting.⁹¹

10 The City and WSDOT's failure to commit to follow their own notice procedures is
11 further documented by the City's Office of Civil Rights, which found that only about two-thirds
12 of sweeps in 2016 were conducted in compliance with the MDARs then in effect.⁹² The OCR
13 Report flags concerning issues in even the sweeps conducted "in compliance" regarding notice,
14 storage, inter-agency coordination, and civil rights impacts.⁹³

15 Proper notice and the opportunity to be heard before seizing and destroying property is
16 critical in the context of the City's sweeps because it affects an already vulnerable population.
17 "For many of us, the loss of our personal effects may pose a minor inconvenience. However,
18

19 ⁸⁷ COS_007313 (attached as Exhibit BB to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

20 ⁸⁸ COS_003094 (attached as Exhibit CC to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

21 ⁸⁹ COS_007287 (attached as Exhibit DD to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

22 ⁹⁰ Exhibit EE attached to the declaration of B. Schuster.

23 ⁹¹ *Id.* It also bears noting that this posting was put up hours after Defendants had originally scheduled a
sweep for that area. *See* Exhibit FF attached to the declaration of B. Schuster; declaration of E.
Rodriguez at ¶ 8(a).

24 ⁹² Exhibit 11 to Connolly Dep. (at p. 2) (attached as Exhibit F to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

⁹³ *Id.*

1 the loss can be devastating for the homeless.” *Lavan*, 693 F.3d at 1032; *Pottinger v. City of*
 2 *Miami*, 810 F. Supp. 1551, 1559 (S.D. Fla. 1992). The City’s practice of on-the-spot destruction
 3 of seized property presents an unacceptable risk of erroneous deprivation, that would be easily
 4 remedied by what the Constitution requires: adequate notice and an opportunity to be heard.

5 **iv. Defendants’ inept and inaccessible storage measures deprives
 6 Plaintiffs of their property without due process**

7 Defendants’ storage process is inconsistent and inadequate to ensure property is actually
 8 stored—presuming it was even eligible for storage in the first place. Defendants conduct sweeps
 9 without giving residents any information about the property-storage process. For example,
 10 according to Amanda Richer, “no one has ever told me about any storage options, or about
 11 delivering my belongings. There was just a sticker saying my items would be thrown away if
 12 I left them on site.”⁹⁴ “Nothing was said about storing anything,” at least up until the day before
 13 the Spokane area sweep in April 2017, either.⁹⁵ And if storage is offered, Defendants “don’t
 14 tell us anything about storage or the sweep until the day of the sweep.”⁹⁶

15 Aside from the general statement that storage is available, Defendants “don’t
 16 tell you where or how to get it back. No one explains anything to you – you just sign a piece
 17 of paper.”⁹⁷ Attempts to gather more information about storage are often futile.⁹⁸ For example,

18 _____
 19 ⁹⁴ Declaration of A. Richer ¶ 16; Declaration of T. Alexander ¶ 8 (explaining the only help he was
 offered if he couldn’t move his belongings in 30 minutes was to have the City throw them away).

20 ⁹⁵ Declaration of R. Massey ¶ 3, P. Pitts ¶ 8 (“And the whole option of storage is not put out as an option
 21 unless you ask for it. The number you can call is just an automated phone number. I know some people
 have gotten the run around – they were told to go to DOT, who then told them to go somewhere else.”).

22 ⁹⁶ Declaration of P. Pitts ¶ 8.

23 ⁹⁷ Declaration of P. Pitts ¶ 9.

24 ⁹⁸ Declaration of C. Potts ¶ 8 (“A number appeared on several flyers posted around the camp . . . [t]he
 flyer explained that residents should call the number in order to schedule storage of their belongings . . .
 I called the number on March 3rd, 2017 and was redirected to the Seattle Human Services desk. No
 one I spoke to that day knew of any city plan to store residents’ personal belongings.”).

1 when the Field was swept in March 2017, even aides to City Councilmembers were unable to
 2 obtain consistent information about storage options.⁹⁹

3 In addition to providing inadequate and inconsistent information regarding storage,
 4 Defendants impose a number of other barriers that make it difficult for individuals to retrieve
 5 any property that was not destroyed. For example, the only information provided to Plaintiffs
 6 after their property has been seized is in the form of a piece of paper that indicates where
 7 belongings were stored, and directs individuals to call the City's Customer Service Bureau line.
 8 Unhoused people who lack a phone, often because they lost that phone during a sweep, are out
 9 of luck. Those individuals who are able to find the number and make the call rarely get a live
 10 person who can actually help them retrieve their belongings, and they often do not get a
 11 response at all.¹⁰⁰ As a result, very few are able to successfully retrieve their belongings.¹⁰¹ In
 12 fact, according to Defendants' own documentation, items have been "retrieved by camper" only
 13 twice between February 22, 2017 and May 1, 2017.¹⁰² Even Mr. Washington, was able to
 14 successfully store some of his belongings, is still missing three bikes that Defendants can't seem
 15 to find.¹⁰³

16
 17
 18

19 ⁹⁹ See Exhibit 3 attached to the declaration of K. Brunette (describing difficulties City Council member
 20 aides had in finding out information about storage opportunities).

21 ¹⁰⁰ Declaration of A. Meisel Gibson ¶ 22; Deposition of B. Osborne at 42, ("I know of a few people that
 22 have taken that option and they don't have their belongings. They can't even get ahold of anybody on
 23 the phone to try to get their belongings, if they're still there.") (attached as Exhibit T to the Declaration
 24 of B. Schuster).

¹⁰¹ Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 37 ("In my 3 years as an emergency room social worker, I have never
 23 encountered an individual who has lost their belongings and successfully retrieved them.").

¹⁰² COS_038747 (attached as Exhibit S to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

¹⁰³ R. Washington Dep. at 119:15–24 (attached as Exhibit GG to the Declaration of B. Schuster).

v. Defendants' purported reasons for not providing adequate notice fail to pass constitutional muster.

Defendants are well aware of the constitutional requirements to provide notice to individuals before seizing and destroying their property—and in fact, frequently do so in a myriad of other contexts, as when evicting individuals from their brick-and-mortar homes.

There is no reason Defendants cannot offer sufficient and adequate notice to unhoused individuals prior to taking their property. In fact, Defendants are often able to provide some form of information to individuals *not* living outside. For example, on March 29, 2017, the City swept an area near the Spokane Street viaduct without providing residents any notice.¹⁰⁴ The City never posted the site for removal.¹⁰⁵ The City, however “was apparently able to inform the general public about the sweep—but not the residents.”¹⁰⁶ On April 11, 2017, another encampment near the Spokane Street viaduct was cleared. The City again had the time to inform the general public about their efforts to clear the area of unhoused people—but the only written information offered to residents was a posting put up in the evening of April 10, 2017,

¹⁰⁴ Declaration of E. Rodriguez ¶ 9(e), regarding the Spokane Street sweep on March 29, 2017, “There was no written notice... No one living there knew they were going to be evicted that day.”; COS_038728 which notes the area was never posted; *See also* site journal for that sweep. (<https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Homelessness/cleanups/03-29-17-Spoken-St-Bike-Trail-Obstruction.pdf>)

¹⁰⁵ Declaration of E. Rodriguez ¶ 9(e), regarding the Spokane Street sweep on March 29, 2017, “There was no written notice... No one living there knew they were going to be evicted that day.”

¹⁰⁶ Declaration of Garth Carroll ¶ 5. See also Addressing trash and tents under the Spokane Street Viaduct, Homelessness Response, available at <https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/Homelessness/cleanups/03-29-17-Spoken-St-Bike-Trail-Obstruction.pdf>, which explains the City will be clearing “the northern bike trail under the Spokane Street Viaduct, beginning on March 29.” This article was dated March 25, 2017. *See also* <http://westseattleblog.com/2017/03/video-navigation-team-out-along-spokane-street-bike-path-before-this-weeks-tent-clearing-trash-cleaning/> (in which Sergeant Eric Zerr, leader of the City’s Navigation Team, describes why the City can consider the area a hazard).

1 which stated that all personal property was to be removed—as of 8:00am that past morning.¹⁰⁷

2 The City claims this retroactive notice was somehow a “courtesy” to Plaintiffs.¹⁰⁸

3 **B. Class Members Have Suffered and Will Continue to Suffer Irreparable Harm in
the Absence of Relief**

4 Each of the Plaintiffs in this litigation has lost critical property as a direct result of
5 Defendants’ ongoing policy and practice of seizing and destroying the property of unhoused
6 people living outside without adequate and effective notice, an opportunity to be heard, or a
7 meaningful way to reclaim any property that was not destroyed. For example:

- 8 • Amanda Richer has lost her tent, mattress, clothing, a grill, cooking stuff, food, and
9 emergency blankets.¹⁰⁹
- 10 • Garth Carroll has lost his tents, tarps, building materials, wooden cabinets and boxes, extra
11 bedding and tools; prescription drugs, hygiene items, clothes, utensils, cooking stuff,
propane, and electronics including laptops, cell phones, and heaters and stoves.¹¹⁰
- 12 • Melvin Christian has lost a gold watch, gold ring, 5 pairs of Michael Jordan tennis shoes,
13 all of his jeans, church clothes, medicine, a DVD player, comic book collection, photos of
14 his ex-girlfriend and states he has been to, photos of his daughter and son, fishing rods,
boxing gloves, mother’s wedding ring from when she died in early 2016, tent, photo of
deceased parents, brother, grandmother, and family together, birth certificate, and ID.¹¹¹
- 15 • Phillip Pitts has lost tents, furniture, bikes, and electronics, including cell phones.¹¹²
- 16 • Teresa Peila has lost her “skillet, clothing, bedding, kitchen stuff, utensils, plates, cups,
17 glasses, shoes, suitcases, tarp”; “an antique manual typewriter, double burner Coleman
18 white gas stove, a Coleman gasoline lantern, a flashlight, a DVD player, a charger for the

20 ¹⁰⁷Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 30-32; Exhibit 2 of Declaration of Jon Grant; Declaration of E. Rodriguez ¶
21 10, noting that there was no posting for the area until the night before the sweep, and that it was
backdated.

22 ¹⁰⁸ Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 31.

23 ¹⁰⁹ Declaration of A. Richer ¶ 13.

24 ¹¹⁰ Declaration of G. Carroll ¶ 7 and 12.

¹¹¹ Declaration of M. Christian.

¹¹² Declaration of P. Pitts ¶ 4-5.

1 DVD player, movies, a harmonica, clothing, my tent, 2 tarps, a down sleeping bag, 2
 2 blankets, books, a bag full of writing utensils, food, a bucket, everything I owned.”¹¹³
 3

4

- 5 • Anna Gibson has lost medications, her Real Change badge and newspapers for work, eulogy
 6 for father, birth certificate and other identification, books, coats, shoes, and other clothing,
 7 tent, and sleeping bags; and her fiancé lost painter whites and an ORCA card. ¹¹⁴
- 8 • Timothy Alexander has lost his tent, shoes, clothing, jeans, and blankets. ¹¹⁵
- 9 • Reavy Washington has lost a brand new grill, a Colman double burning stove, 2 boom-
 10 boxes, a home docking station stereo, a DVD player, 30 DVDs, clothes, including jeans,
 11 work gear like pants, jackets, and steel toe boots, canisters of propane, a craftsmen wrench
 12 set, glasses, jewelry like a watch, gold chain, and men’s ring, binoculars, a canopy for the
 13 kitchen, plates, pots, pans, 2 tents, a bed, and other miscellaneous stuff. ¹¹⁶
- 14 • Unhoused patients of Kelleigh Kinst have lost medication like blood thinners, antibiotics,
 15 insulin, anti-convulsants, anti-anxiety medication, anti-depressants, mood stabilizers, and
 16 anti-psychotic medication; weather appropriate clothing, shoes, bedding, sleeping bags,
 17 tents, socks, food, tools or utensils to cook or eat with, identification, cash, hygiene items;
 18 clothing they planned to wear for job interview; family pictures and heirlooms or mementos;
 19 important toiletries and hygiene items. ¹¹⁷

20 Plaintiffs remain at substantial risk of having their property seized and destroyed by
 21 Defendants, as Plaintiffs will continue to live outside and Defendants’ sweeps are ongoing. As
 22 Ms. Drake-Ericson explained when asked how she determines the schedule for a sweep:

23 A. I look at a calendar and say we have so many days in a month and essentially **the**
 24 **goal is to have an event four days out of the week.** So that gives us a time frame of
 25 when sweeps can occur.¹¹⁸

26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31¹¹³ Declaration of T. Peila at 4 and 9.
 32

33¹¹⁴ Declaration of A. Gibson ¶ 12.
 34

35¹¹⁵ Declaration of T. Alexander ¶ 12.
 36

37¹¹⁶ Declaration of R. Washington ¶ 23 (attached as Exhibit GG to the Declaration of B. Schuster).
 38

39¹¹⁷ Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 12, 21, 25, 28, and 30.
 40

41¹¹⁸ Drake-Ericson Dep. at 71:23-72:3 (emphasis added) (attached as Exhibit B to the Declaration of B.
 42 Schuster).

1 Notwithstanding Ms. Drake-Ericson's statement, City records reflect that sweeps occur more
 2 than four days a week.¹¹⁹ And as the evidence shows, Defendants routinely seize and destroy
 3 Plaintiffs' property without providing adequate or effective notice, an opportunity to be heard,
 4 or a meaningful way for Plaintiffs to reclaim any belongings not immediately destroyed.
 5 Absent court intervention, Plaintiffs are at serious and imminent risk of additional deprivation
 6 as a result of these practices.

7 When unhoused people are deprived of their property, whether because Defendants
 8 summarily destroyed it or seized it without providing a meaningful opportunity to get it back,
 9 unhoused individuals suffer serious mental and physical injuries. The direct consequences of
 10 losing property includes but is not limited to loss of sleep as a result of losing bedding and
 11 mattresses;¹²⁰ physical pain, illness, and hypothermia from the loss of appropriate clothing and
 12 shelter; starvation from the loss of food items or appropriate cooking utensils; and
 13 embarrassment, toxic shock syndrome, and scabies from the loss of essential hygiene items.¹²¹
 14 The consequences of losing property also include falling behind in school as a result of losing
 15 textbooks, missing job opportunities because individuals no longer have anything to wear, or

17 ¹¹⁹ COS_038747 (attached as Exhibit S to the Declaration of B. Schuster);
 18 <https://www.seattle.gov/homelessness/unauthorized-encampments/encampment-removals#may8122017>.

19 ¹²⁰ E.g. Declaration of A. Richer ¶ 17-19 ("For example, I have spondyloarthritis and fibromyalgia. I
 20 have had s traumatic brain injuries and a diffuse axonal injury. Then there are second injuries I have
 21 related to these injuries. With these issues, I really need to be able to sleep properly, and I need things
 22 like a mattress to be able to sleep without being in pain. Without my mattress, I hurt so badly, and I can't
 23 get a full night's sleep. This then causes a decline in cognitive abilities. I can't remember time, I can't
 24 remember dates, I can't remember days. I'm having trouble remembering things. I'm trying so hard. I
 am not asking for much, I just want to be able to have a mattress on the ground.").

¹²¹ Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 28-29 (describing an incident in March 2017 where an individual contracted
 scabies because "[t]he morning she hugged her friend, [with scabie] all of her belongings, including her
 body wash and shampoo, had been tossed by the City or WSDOT in a sweep. She did not have the
 money to buy new soap nor the bus money to travel to the Urban Rest Stop in downtown Seattle where
 she could wash her clothes and take a shower with complimentary toiletries.").

1 being forced to stay in an abusive relationship because the requisite court documents one needed
 2 to leave were taken by the City.¹²² “Losing identification papers means individuals are left with
 3 no identity. Not only are there numerous essential functions they are unable to perform, but
 4 they aren’t able to get back their identity because the documents that were lost in the sweep are
 5 required to obtain new identification papers.”¹²³ When individuals lose critical medication
 6 during a sweep, they can suffer increased anxiety or depression, and are at greater risk of stroke,
 7 seizures, diabetic coma, and blot clots and the consequences of each of these events, including
 8 brain damage, paralysis, or a heart attack.¹²⁴ Finally, the loss of personal items, like family
 9 photos, is “devastating on a human level” and can affect individuals for years.¹²⁵

10 Plaintiffs also suffer the injury of the constant anxiety and fear of being swept, not to
 11 mention the injury of being forced to make impossible choices about how to replace items
 12 needed to survive outside and remain stable. Some have to choose between replacing critical
 13 medication and obtaining shelter for that night.¹²⁶ For others, it is impossible to even begin to
 14 replace the vast majority of their property.¹²⁷

15 Further, because the sweeps so frequently happen without adequate and effective notice,
 16 they “exacerbate people’s mental health issue . . . They cause instability, insecurity, and in that

18 ¹²² Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 20-30.

19 ¹²³ Declaration of D. Montrose.

20 ¹²⁴ Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 13-15.

21 ¹²⁵ Declaration of J. Martin ¶ 4; see also Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 30.

22 ¹²⁶ Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 19. (“We try our best to accommodate and treat every patient that comes
 23 in. However the sweeps make it very difficult to do so. Another issue that comes up is that many times
 24 we see individuals who have to choose between obtaining necessary medication and finding an indoor
 place to sleep at night. Numerous individuals have come in with a medical complaint, but the emergency
room can take a long time to resolve their issue and they need to get in line for a shelter. Sometimes
people will choose to get in line for the shelter rather than refill their medication, and the most we can
do for them is call a taxi to take them there.”)

25 ¹²⁷ Declaration of T. Peila ¶ 13; Declaration of A. Richer ¶ 20.

1 instability, it's hard to continue to try to function on a somewhat normal level because you're
 2 already having trouble.”¹²⁸ And because individuals are so afraid of leaving their belongings
 3 unattended for fear they will be summarily seized, they are confined to their home 24 hours a
 4 day, 7 days a week—afraid of leaving to pursue hobbies,¹²⁹ work or secure a job,¹³⁰ or even go
 5 to the bathroom.¹³¹

6 **C. The Balance of Equities Is in Plaintiffs' Favor**

7 The balance of equities tips sharply to Plaintiffs. Defendants seize and destroy the only
 8 property that Plaintiffs own—property that constitutes Plaintiffs' only forms of shelter and
 9 warmth; essential medication for their physical and mental health; vital documents like court
 10 papers and identification documents; food and requisite cooking utensils; and numerous
 11 irreplaceable family mementos.

12 And while Plaintiffs will continue to suffer irreparable harm if an injunction is not
 13 granted, the City will not suffer if it is ordered to follow the law, as Los Angeles was also
 14 ordered to in *Lavan* and *Mitchell*. Plaintiffs' interests in survival also outweighs Defendants'
 15 (often speculative) public health and safety concerns—especially since Defendants could easily
 16 take measures to control the very health and safety concerns they cite without destroying and
 17 seizing Plaintiffs' property. For example, one service provider has stated “[w]e can bring them
 18 portable toilets, garbage collection, rat traps, rat-proof food containers, and housing case
 19 managers. If we do this, we can create safer situations right now while building housing for all
 20 without violating anyone's civil rights or creating public health hazards.”¹³²

21
 22 ¹²⁸ Declaration of A. Richer ¶ 19

23 ¹²⁹ Declaration of A. Richer ¶ 22.

24 ¹³⁰ Declaration of A. Gibson ¶ 13, 19; Declaration of P. Pitts ¶ 13.

¹³¹ Declaration of A. Gibson ¶ 20.

¹³² Declaration of Patacara Community Services ¶ 10.

1 Defendants' nebulous health and safety concerns also run contrary to the *Lavan* Court's
 2 insistence that only "immediate health and safety" concerns could possibly justify infringing
 3 homeless individuals' property rights. *Lavan* at 1026. In fact, the Ninth Circuit specifically
 4 imposed that limitation even though in Los Angeles, as here, had pointed out that it swept
 5 sidewalk encampments with "rotting food, fecal matter, and drug paraphernalia." *Id.* at 1034.
 6 Other courts have similarly confined sweeps to "immediate" public health and safety risks. *See*
 7 *Mitchell v. Los Angeles*, Case 2:16-cv-01750-SJO-JPR (C.D. Cal. April 13, 2016), Dkt. No. 51
 8 at 11 (granting preliminary injunction preventing Defendants from seizing property "absent an
 9 objectively reasonable belief that it is abandoned, presents an immediate threat to public health
 10 or safety, is evidence of a crime, or is contraband"); *Kincaid v. City of Fresno*, No. 1:06-cv-
 11 1445 OWW SMS, 2006 WL 3542732, at *42 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2006) (granting preliminary
 12 injunction; enjoining defendants from seizing and immediately destroying the property of
 13 homeless persons, absent probable cause to believe that the property is evidence of a crime,
 14 contraband, or presents an immediate threat to public health or safety).

15 **D. A Preliminary Injunction Is In the Public Interest**

16 The "public has a fundamental interest in the protection of all people's constitutional
 17 rights." *Klein v. City of Laguna Beach*, 381 F. App'x 723, 727 (9th Cir. 2010).

18 In 2017, the number of unhoused individuals living outside reached an all-time high—
 19 meaning more individuals are now part of the proposed class and at risk of imminent harm.¹³³
 20 And while Defendants' assert that sweeps are for the health and safety of Plaintiffs and their
 21 fellow class members as a reason for sweeping encampments, the irony is that Defendants'
 22 practices directly place the health and safety of encampment residents in peril. For example,

23
 24 ¹³³ Count Us In: 2017 King County Point in Time Count of People Experiencing Homelessness.
 Available at <http://allhomekc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/2017-King-PIT-Count-Comprehensive-Report-FINAL-DRAFT-5.31.17.pdf>

“The loss of medication not only harms the individual, but the community at large—and it is an issue of public health and safety . . . there are varied risks to someone with a mental illness that has a component of psychosis when they are off their medication. One of them could become a danger to themselves or others.”¹³⁴

If Defendants wanted to actually address alleged public health and safety concerns of encampments, they could do so without seizing and destroying the property of unhoused persons. For example, as the declarations of Mr. Roberts, Mr. Grant, Ms. Brunette, and Ms. Raftery show that it is not only possible, but actually quite simple, to conduct a clean-up of an area where unhoused individuals live without throwing away the critical possession of people who live there.¹³⁵

III. CONCLUSION

This action challenges an ongoing practice and policy of the City of Seattle and WSDOT of seizing and destroying the property of people who are unhoused and living outside within the City of Seattle. For the aforementioned reasons, Plaintiffs and members of the proposed class are entitled to injunctive relief to ensure adequate notice and to prevent their property from being destroyed. A proposed order is submitted herewith.

DATED this 14th day of June, 2017.

CORR CRONIN MICHELSON
BAUMGARDNER FOGG & MOORE LLP

s/ Todd T. Williams

Blake Marks-Dias, WSBA No. 28169
Todd T. Williams, WSBA No. 45032
Eric A. Lindberg, WSBA No. 43596
1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3900

¹³⁴ Declaration of K. Kinst ¶ 16.

¹³⁵ Declaration of A. Roberts ¶ 9-10; Declaration of K. Brunette ¶ 3-4, 6; Declaration of A. Raftery ¶ 6; Declaration of J. Grant ¶ 12.

1 Seattle, Washington 98154-1051
2 Telephone: (206) 625-8600
3 Email: bmarksdias@corrcronin.com
twilliams@corrcronin.com
elindberg@corrcronin.com

4 Emily Chiang, WSBA No. 50517
5 Nancy Talner, WSBA No. 11196
6 Breanne Schuster, WSBA No. 49993
7 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
8 OF WASHINGTON FOUNDATION
9 901 Fifth Avenue, Suite 630
Seattle, Washington 98164
Telephone: (206) 624-2184
Email: echiang@aclu-wa.org
talner@aclu-wa.org
bschuster@aclu-wa.org

10 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on **June 14, 2017**, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following:

<p>Attorneys for Defendant City of Seattle:</p> <p>Matthew J. Segal, WSBA No. 29797 Gregory J. Wong, WSBA No. 39329 Taki V. Flevaris, WSBA No. 42555 PACIFICA LAW GROUP LLP 1191 2nd Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98101 matthew.segal@pacificalawgroup.com greg.wong@pacificalawgroup.com taki.flevaris@pacificalawgroup.com</p> <p>Patrick Downs, WSBA No. 25276 Andrew T. Myerberg, WSBA No. 47746 Gregory C. Narver, WSBA No. 18127 Carlton W.M. Seu, WSBA No. 26830 Gary T. Smith, WSBA No. 29718 SEATTLE CITY ATTORNEY 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2050 Seattle, WA 98104-70197 patrick.downs@seattle.gov andrew.myerberg@seattle.gov gregory.narver@seattle.gov carlton.seu@seattle.gov gary.smith@seattle.gov</p>	<p>Attorneys for Defendants Washington State Department of Transportation and Roger Millar, Secretary of Transportation for WSDOT:</p> <p>Alicia O. Young, WSBA No. 35553 Assistant Attorney General ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON P.O. Box 40126 Olympia, WA 98504-0126 AliciaO@atg.wa.gov</p> <p>Matthew D. Huot, WSBA No. 40606 Assistant Attorney General ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WASHINGTON P.O. Box 40113 Olympia, WA 98504-0113 MattH4@atg.wa.gov</p>
--	---

CORR CRONIN MICHELSON
BAUMGARDNER FOGG & MOORE LLP

s/ Todd T. Williams

Todd T. Williams, WSBA No. 45032
1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3900
Seattle, Washington 98154-1051
Telephone: (206) 625-8600
Email: twilliams@corrchronin.com